Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/643,985	SEKIJIMA ET AL.
	Examiner	.Art Unit
	G. Nagesh Rao	1722
All Participants:	Status of Application	1:
(1) <u>G. Nagesh Rao</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Edward Meilman</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 24 January 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	.pplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
15		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the applicatio of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief suit</li> </ul>	n. The examiner will provide a	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
	•	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	olicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Due to a printer query, examiner called Mr. Meilman to inform him that dependent claim 15 was improperly dependent on itself and needed to be corrected. Mr. Meilman informed Examiner Rao that claim 15 should be dependent on claim 1. Error was corrected in the supplemental examiner's amendment.